arXiv:1409.0193v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 25 Nov 2014

The spin-1/2 square-lattice J_1-J_2 model: The spin-gap issue

J. Richter[1], R. Zinke[2], and D.J.J. Farnell[3]

[1] Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Magdeburg, 39016 Magdeburg, Germany

[2] Institut für Apparate- und Umwelttechnik, Universität Magdeburg, 39016 Magdeburg, Germany

[3] School of Dentistry, Cardiff University Cardiff CF14 4XY, Wales UK

November 26, 2014

Abstract

We use the coupled cluster method to high orders of approximation in order to calculate the ground-state energy, the ground-state magnetic order parameter, and the spin gap of the spin-1/2 J_1-J_2 model on the square lattice. We obtain values for the transition points to the magnetically disordered quantum paramagnetic phase of $J_2^{c1} = 0.454 J_1$ and $J_2^{c2} = 0.588 J_1$. The spin gap is zero in the entire parameter region accessible by our approach, i.e. for $J_2 \leq 0.49 J_1$ and $J_2 > 0.58 J_1$. This finding is in favor of a gapless spin-liquid ground-state in this parameter regime.

PACS codes:
75.10.Jm Quantized spin models
75.45.+j Macroscopic quantum phenomena in magnetic systems

1 Introduction

The spin-1/2 quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnet with nearest-neighbor (NN), $J_1 > 0$, and next-nearest-neighbor (NNN) bonds, $J_2 \geq 0$, described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = J_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j + J_2 \sum_{\langle\langle ij \rangle\rangle} \mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j \tag{1}$$

is one of the most challenging quantum spin models. The model was introduced more than 25 years ago in order to describe the breakdown of Néel antiferromagnetic (NAF) long-range order (LRO) in cuprate superconductors. [1–3]

This model has since attracted much attention as a canonical model for studying frustration driven quantum phase transitions between semiclassical ground-state phases with magnetic LRO and magnetically disordered quantum phases, see, e.g., Refs. [1–40]. These studies demonstrate clearly that there is a magnetically disordered spin-rotation-invariant quantum phase in the region of strong frustration $0.44 \lesssim J_2/J_1 \lesssim 0.6$. Although the semi-classical ground-state phases of the model, namely the NAF LRO at $J_2/J_1 \lesssim 0.44$ and the collinear antiferromagnetic (CAF) LRO at $J_2/J_1 \gtrsim 0.6$ are well-understood, an active controversial debate has started very recently regarding the nature of the intermediate quantum phase in this model and its quantum phase transitions. [14, 20, 27–40] Most of the papers argue that the transition at about $J_2/J_1 \approx 0.44$ is continuous, but that the transition at about $J_2/J_1 \approx 0.6$ is of first order, see, e.g., Refs. [4, 10, 12, 27, 30, 40].

A particular focus of these recent papers has been on the existence of an excitation gap in the intermediate quantum phase. Those papers in favor of an excitation gap are given by Refs. [24,28, 30,35,37]. We remark that a finite gap between a spin-rotation-invariant singlet ground state and a magnetic triplet excitation (spin gap) would be in accordance with earlier results in favor of a valence-bond ground state breaking translational symmetry, see e.g., Refs. [3,5,7,10,14,16,20]. In contrast to these findings, there are several recent investigations reporting indications of a gapless spin liquid state. [29, 31, 32, 40] Very recent calculations using density matrix renormalization group with explicit implementation of $SU(2)$ spin rotation symmetry in Ref. [34] have found a gapless spin liquid for $0.44 < J_2/J_1 < 0.5$ and a gapped plaquette valence bond phase for $0.5 < J_2/J_1 < 0.61$.

In addition to the basic theoretical interest in this frustrated quantum many-body model, we mention that interest in this model is motivated also by its relation to experimental studies of various magnetic materials, such as $VOMoO_4$ (Ref. [41]), Li_2VOSiO_4, and Li_2VOGeO_4 (Ref. [42]). However, none of these materials has as yet exhibited exchange parameters J_1 and J_2 suitable for a magnetically disordered phase at very low temperatures.

In this paper we focus on the calculation of the gap to triplet excitations (spin gap) using a very general *ab initio* many-body technique, the coupled-cluster method (CCM), that was successfully applied in various fields of many-body physics. [43] The spin gap can be calculated directly within the framework of the CCM by using an appropriate excited-state formalism. [44–47]

2 Brief illustration of the coupled-cluster method

We illustrate here only some relevant features of the CCM. For more general information on the methodology of the CCM, see, e.g., Refs. [43, 45, 47–49]. The CCM has recently been applied widely to frustrated quantum spin systems, see, e.g., Refs. [9,15,19,20,46,47,50–60]. In particular, the CCM has been applied to calculate the ground-state properties of model (1) in two recent publications [20,53], although the spin gap of the model has never before been calculated by using the CCM.

We mention firstly that the CCM automatically yields results in the limit $N \to \infty$. Here we follow Refs. [20] and [53] to calculate the ground-state properties of the model using the CCM. The starting point for a CCM calculation is the choice of a normalized reference (or model) state $|\Phi\rangle$. We then define a set of mutually commuting multispin creation operators C_I^+ with respect to this state, where the index I runs over a complete set of many-body configurations. For the system under consideration here we choose as CCM reference states the two-sublattice Néel state for small J_2/J_1 and for large J_2/J_1 one of two possible collinear striped states. Although these CCM reference states are magnetically ordered states, various applications of the CCM to one- and two-dimensional quantum spin systems demonstrate that high-order implementations of the CCM are appropriate to describe magnetically disordered ground-state phases, see e.g. Refs. [15, 19, 20, 46, 51, 54, 56–60].

We perform a rotation of the local axis of the spins such that all spins in the reference state align along the negative z axis. In the rotated coordinate frame the reference state reads $|\Phi\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle|\downarrow\rangle|\downarrow\rangle \ldots$, and we can treat each site equivalently. The corresponding multispin creation operators are written as $C_I^+ = s_i^+,\ s_i^+ s_j^+,\ s_i^+ s_j^+ s_k^+, \cdots$, where the indices $i, j, k, \ldots$ denote arbitrary lattice sites.

The CCM parameterizations of the ket- and bra- ground states are given by

$$\begin{aligned} H|\Psi\rangle = E|\Psi\rangle; \qquad & \langle\tilde{\Psi}|H = E\langle\tilde{\Psi}|; \\ |\Psi\rangle = e^{S}|\Phi\rangle, \qquad & S = \sum_{I\neq 0}\mathcal{S}_I C_I^{+}; \\ \langle\tilde{\Psi}| = \langle\Phi|\tilde{S}e^{-S}, \qquad & \tilde{S} = 1 + \sum_{I\neq 0}\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_I C_I^{-}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

By using the Schrödinger equation, $H|\Psi\rangle = E|\Psi\rangle$, we can write the ground-state energy as $E_{\rm GS} = \langle\Phi|e^{-S}He^{S}|\Phi\rangle$. The magnetic order parameter (sublattice magnetization) is given by

$$m_s = -\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\langle\tilde{\Psi}|s_i^z|\Psi\rangle, \tag{3}$$

where s_i^z is expressed in the rotated coordinate system. The ket-state and bra-state correlation coefficients are obtained by solving the CCM ket- and bra-state equations given by

$$\langle\Phi|C_I^{-}e^{-S}He^{S}|\Phi\rangle = 0, \qquad \forall I \neq 0, \tag{4}$$

$$\langle\Phi|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}e^{-S}[H, C_I^{+}]e^{S}|\Phi\rangle = 0, \qquad \forall I \neq 0. \tag{5}$$

Each ket- or bra-state equation belongs to a certain creation operator $C_I^{+} = s_i^{+},\ s_i^{+}s_j^{+},\ s_i^{+}s_j^{+}s_k^{+}, \cdots$, i.e. it corresponds to a certain set (configuration) of lattice sites $i, j, k, \ldots$. For the problem at hand only those correlation coefficients $\mathcal{S}_I$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_I$ related to clusters with even numbers of spin flips are different from zero. The ket or bra ground states belong to total spin $S^z = 0$. We use an enlarged unit cell of four sites for the CCM calculations in order to allow for the possibility of CCM solutions that break translational symmetry, e.g., for gapped valence-bond ground states.

We use the well established LSUBn approximation scheme in order to truncate the expansion of S and $\tilde{S}$, cf., e.g., Refs. [20, 45, 49, 53, 54, 56–60]. Within the LSUBn scheme all multispin correlations over all distinct locales on the lattice defined by n or fewer contiguous sites are taken into account in the correlation operators S and $\tilde{S}$. Although the ground state is not in the focus of the present paper, we present here results including the LSUB12 approximation, which goes beyond the LSUB10 approximation presented in Refs. [20] and [53]. This increase in the level of approximation yields an improvement of the accuracy of the ground-state data.

In order to calculate the gap to triplet excitations we follow Refs. [46] and [47], where the spin gap was calculated by CCM for the two-dimensional $J - J'$ model [61] and the one-dimensional J_1-J_2 model, [62] respectively. Both models exhibit a quantum phase transition from a gapless phase to a gapped valence-bond phase. It was found in Refs. [46] and [47] that the opening of the spin gap at the transition point to the valence-bond phase is well described by the CCM.

To obtain the excited state $|\Psi_e\rangle$ from the ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ (2) we apply an excitation operator X^e linearly to $|\Psi\rangle$, such that

$$|\Psi_e\rangle = X^e e^{S}|\Phi\rangle; \quad X^e = \sum_{I\neq 0}\mathcal{X}_I^e C_I^{+}. \tag{6}$$

Using the Schrödinger equation, $H|\Psi_e\rangle = E_e|\Psi_e\rangle$, we find that

$$\Delta_e X^e|\Phi\rangle = e^{-S}[H, X^e]_{-}e^{S}|\Phi\rangle, \tag{7}$$

where $\Delta = E_e - E_{\rm GS}$ is the spin gap. Applying $\langle\Phi|C_I$ to Eq. (7) we find

$$\Delta_e\mathcal{X}_I^e = \langle\Phi|C_I e^{-S}[H, X^e]_{-}e^{S}|\Phi\rangle, \tag{8}$$

which we solve in order to get Δ_e. The choice of configurations in the excitation operator is restricted to contain only those which change the total spin S^z by one. Hence, the choice of clusters for the excited-state is different from those for the ground state. For the excited state we use the same approximation scheme, LSUBn, as for the ground state thus achieving comparable accuracy for both the ground and the excited states. We find that for high orders of approximation the number of configurations for the excited state is larger than that for the ground state, i.e. the calculation of the excited state is more difficult computationally.

The LSUBn approximation becomes exact for $n \to \infty$, and so we can improve our results by extrapolating the "raw" LSUBn data to $n \to \infty$. There are well-tested extrapolation rules [15,19,20,46,47,51–54,56–60] for the ground-state energy per spin $e_{\rm GS} = E_{\rm GS}(n)/N$, the magnetic order parameter $m_s(n)$, and the spin gap $\Delta_e(n)$. We use $e_{\rm GS}(n) = a_0 + a_1(1/n)^2 + a_2(1/n)^4$ for the ground-state energy, $m_s(n) = b_0 + b_1(1/n)^{1/2} + b_2(1/n)^{3/2}$ for the magnetic order parameter, and $\Delta_e(n) = c_0 + c_1(1/n) + c_2(1/n)^2$ for the spin gap. Moreover, we know from Refs. [18–20, 53] that the lowest level of approximation, LSUB2, conforms poorly to these rules. Hence, as in previous calculations, [18–20, 53] we exclude LSUB2 data from the extrapolations.



Figure 1: Ground-state energy per spin plotted as a function of the frustration parameter J_2/J_1.

3 Results and discussion

In order to obtain results for the ground-state energy per spin, $e_{\rm GS}$, the magnetic order parameter (sublattice magnetization), m_s, and the spin gap, Δ_e, we solved numerically up to 1, 374, 389 equations (for the LSUB12 approximation of the excited state starting with the Néel reference state) using the code of Schulenburg and Farnell. [63] Unfortunately, for the collinear striped reference state we can present LSUB12 data for the ground state only. For the spin gap we are limited to LSUB10, since the number of equations is higher (namely 2, 266, 307 for LSUB12 approximation of the excited state) than that for the Néel reference state. We find stable solutions for the CCM equations at given level of LSUBn approximation for the pure Heisenberg antiferromagnet



Figure 2: Magnetic order parameter (sublattice magnetization) m_s plotted as a function of the frustration parameter J_2/J_1.

($J_2 = 0$) and then we track this stable solution until it terminates at $J_2/J_1 = 0.59$ (LSUB4), 0.54 (LSUB6), 0.52 (LSUB8), 0.50 (LSUB10), 0.49 (LSUB12), respectively. We notice that this allows to us consider a parameter region that is noticeably beyond the presumably continuous transition between the NAF phase and the quantum phase. On the other side of the phase diagram the transition to the quantum phase is likely first order, and, therefore, below the CCM transition point at $J_2^{c2}/J_1 = 0.588$ (see below) the validity of the CCM data starting from the collinear striped reference state becomes questionable.

Although our paper focusses primarily on the calculation of the spin gap, we present firstly results for the ground-state energy per spin (Fig. 1) and the sublattice magnetization (Fig. 2). The results for the spin gap are then shown (Fig. 3). In all figures we show LSUBn data for $n = 4, 6, 8, 10, 12$ as well as data extrapolated to $n = \infty$, where extrapolations including new LSUB12 data are labeled by 'ex 4-12' and the extrapolations without including LSUB12 data are labeled by 'ex 4-10'. Note that the graphs for $e_{\rm GS}$ and m_s are very similar to those of Ref. [20], although LSUB12 data are now included for $J_2/J_1 \leq 0.49$ and $J_2/J_1 \geq 0.56$. The comparison of both curves ('ex 4-12' and "ex 4-10', with and without LSUB12, respectively) allows us to form an impression on the accuracy of the extrapolated CCM results.

Taking into account the new LSUB12 data we find for the phase transition points between the semiclassical phases and the quantum phase $J_2^{c1} = 0.454 J_1$ and $J_2^{c2} = 0.588 J_1$, whereas the previous CCM values (without LSUB12 data) were $J_2^{c1} = 0.447 J_1$ and $J_2^{c2} = 0.586 J_1$, (see Ref. [20]). These results are in good agreement with the density matrix renormalization group data of Ref. [34]. Let us mention that many of the earlier attempts to determine the transition points obtained values $J_2^{c1} \approx 0.4$ (or even smaller values), see e.g., Refs. [4, 10–13, 17]. In view of our results at hand and other recent results [34, 40] the transition point is rather at higher values $J_2^{c1} \sim (0.44 \ldots 0.45) J_1$.

The ground-state energy $e_{\rm GS}$ (Fig. 1) shows a monotonic increase with increasing J_2 for the Néel reference state. This figure shows also that there is a monotonic increase of $e_{\rm GS}$ with decreasing



Figure 3: Spin gap Δ_e plotted as a function of the frustration parameter J_2/J_1. Note the beyond $J_2/J_1 = 0.58$, where the collinear striped state is used as the CCM reference state, we are not able to present LSUB12 data, since the number of equations which have to be solved within the excited-state formalism exceeds the available computational resources, see also main text.

J_2 (until about $J_2 \sim 0.57 \ldots 58 J_1$, i.e. slightly beyond the transition point J_2^{c2}), starting from the regime of large J_2 and using the collinear striped reference state. For values of $J_2 \lesssim 0.58 J_1$, we see that there is a drastic downturn in $e_{\rm GS}$, which indicates that the CCM using the collinear striped reference state becomes inappropriate beyond J_2^{c2}.

The results for the magnetic order parameter m_s shown in Fig. 2 may be used in order to determine the above reported transition points, J_2^{c1} and J_2^{c2}, at which the order parameter vanishes. Fig. 2 shows continuous behavior for the order parameter near J_2^{c1} and near J_2^{c2}. However, it is clear from this figure that the decrease of the CAF order parameter to zero at J_2^{c2} is much steeper and more abrupt than the corresponding decay of the NAF order parameter at J_2^{c1}. This behavior might be an indication of a continuous transition at J_2^{c1} and of a first-order transition at J_2^{c2}.

Results for the spin gap Δ_e are presented in Fig. 3. These data show a monotonic behavior of Δ_e with increasing level n of the CCM-LSUBn approximation for all values of J_2, which indicates that the extrapolation to $n \to \infty$ as described Sec. 2 is reasonable. A consistency check of our spin-gap data is also provided by our results within the semiclassical ground state phases with magnetic LRO, i.e. for for $J_2 \leq J_2^{c1}$ and $J_2 \geq J_2^{c2}$, where the spin gap has to be zero. Indeed, our extrapolated results for Δ_e in the limit $n \to \infty$ are very close to zero within the NAF phase. In the the CAF phase we obtain a small finite $\Delta_e(n = \infty)$, which indicates that extrapolations in this regime are less accurate. [64]

The most relevant and important results for the current discussion relating the "spin-gap issue" concern our results for the spin gap in the region $J_2 > J_2^{c1}$. As already mentioned above we compare two extrapolations labeled by 'ex 4-12' (including the LSUB12 data in the extrapolation) and by 'ex 4-10' (without including the LSUB12 data in the extrapolation). We can consider the difference between both extrapolations as a measure of the accuracy of the extrapolated spin-gap data. As for the ground-state energy and the magnetic order parameter both extrapolations for

the spin gap almost coincide which yields evidence that the extrapolation works very well and our extrapolated data are almost converged, and likely higher-order approximations would not modify our results noticeably. We remark again that the Néel reference state allows us to find results up to $J_2 = 0.49J_1$ for approximation level LSUB12 (and even larger values of J_2 for lower approximation levels, see Fig. 3), which is clearly inside the magnetically disordered quantum regime. We find that there is no significant increase of the LSUBn values for the spin gap in the parameter region accessible by using the Néel reference state for $J_2 > J_2^{c1}$, i.e. for a considerable region inside the magnetically disordered quantum phase. Also the extrapolated spin gap $\Delta_e(n \to \infty)$ available until $J_2 = 0.49J_1$ remains practically zero. Thus, our CCM results for the spin gap are in favor of a gapless spin liquid [65] in accordance with Refs. [31, 32, 34, 39, 40]. However, our results do not rule out the possibility that a spin gap occurs within the parameter region $0.49 \leq J_2/J_1 \leq 0.59$, as indicated by recent density matrix renormalization group calculations. [34]

Let us briefly discuss these findings in relation to previous CCM results concerning a possible valence-bond solid ground state. [20] In Ref. [20] generalized susceptibilities related to possible valence-bond states were calculated. Starting from the pure Heisenberg model at $J_2 = 0$ (i.e., in the Néel phase), both susceptibilities for the columnar dimerized and plaquette valence-bond states grow monotonically with increasing J_2, cf. Figs. 8 and 9 in Ref. [20]. These susceptibilities become very large, but remain finite in the region around J_2^{c1}; this behavior was interpreted as an indication for the emergence of a valence-bond solid phase. In view of our new CCM results for the spin gap a more consistent interpretation is that of enhanced dimer-dimer or/and plaquette-plaquette correlations which may be even critical (i.e. with a power-law decay without valence-bond LRO [65]) in a small but finite regime $0.454 \leq J_2/J_1 \leq 0.49$, cf. also Refs. [34, 39]. Note, however, that the results for the generalized susceptibilities presented in Ref. [20] are in accordance with a plaquette ordered quantum phase proposed in Ref. [34] for $J_2/J_1 \gtrsim 0.5$.

4 Summary

We have used a general *ab initio* many-body technique called the coupled-cluster method (CCM) to high orders of approximation in order to calculate ground-state properties and the triplet excitation gap of the square-lattice $s = 1/2$ J_1-J_2 model. Our results for the transition points, $J_2^{c1} = 0.454J_1$ and $J_2^{c2} = 0.588J_1$, between the semiclassical ground-state phases with magnetic LRO and the intermediate magnetically disordered quantum phase are in very good agreement with recent density matrix renormalization group calculations. [34] The direct calculation of the spin gap within the intermediate quantum phase, which is possible until $J_2/J_1 = 0.49$, does not give any hint for an opening of a spin gap in this phase. Therefore, our results are in favor of a gapless spin-liquid quantum ground state in the region $J_2^{c1} < J_2 \lesssim 0.49J_1$. However, a gapped phase for $J_2/J_1 \gtrsim 0.5$ cannot be ruled out, because our CCM approach becomes inappropriate for $0.49 \lesssim J_2/J_1 \lesssim 0.58$.

Acknowledgments

For the numerical calculation we used the program package 'The crystallographic CCM' (D. J. J. Farnell and J. Schulenburg). [63]

References

[1] M. Inui, S. Doniach, and M. Gabay, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 6631 (1988).

[2] P. Chandra and B. Doucot, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 9335 (1988).

[3] E. Dagotto and A. Moreo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 2148 (1989).

[4] H.J. Schulz and T.A.L. Ziman, Europhys. Lett. **18**, 355 (1992); H.J. Schulz, T.A.L. Ziman, and D. Poilblanc, J. Phys. I **6**, 675 (1996).

[5] J. Richter, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 5794 (1993).

[6] J. Richter, N.B. Ivanov, and K. Retzlaff, Europhys. Lett. **25**, 545 (1994).

[7] M.E. Zhitomirsky and K. Ueda, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 9007 (1996).

[8] A. E. Trumper, L. O. Manuel, C. J. Gazza, and H. A. Ceccatto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2216 (1997).

[9] R.F. Bishop, D.J.J. Farnell, and J.B. Parkinson, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 6394 (1998).

[10] R. R. P. Singh, Z. Weihong, C. J. Hamer, and J. Oitmaa, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 7278 (1999).

[11] L. Capriotti, F. Becca, A. Parola, and S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 097201 (2001).

[12] O. P. Sushkov, J. Oitmaa, and Z. Weihong, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 104420 (2001).

[13] L. Siurakshina, D. Ihle, and R. Hayn, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 104406 (2001).

[14] J. Sirker, Z. Weihong, O. P. Sushkov, and J. Oitmaa, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 184420 (2006).

[15] D. Schmalfuß, R. Darradi, J. Richter, J. Schulenburg, and D. Ihle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 157201 (2006).

[16] M. Mambrini, A. Läuchli, D. Poilblanc, and F.Mila, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 144422 (2006).

[17] J.R. Viana and J.R. de Sousa, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 052403 (2007).

[18] R.F. Bishop, P.H.Y. Li, R. Darradi, and J. Richter, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **20**, 255251 (2008).

[19] R.F. Bishop, P.H.Y. Li, R. Darradi, J. Schulenburg and J. Richter, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 054412 (2008).

[20] R. Darradi, O. Derzhko, R. Zinke, J. Schulenburg, S. E. Krüger, and J. Richter, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 214415 (2008).

[21] L. Isaev, G. Ortiz, and J. Dukelsky, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 024409 (2009).

[22] T. Pardini and R.R.P. Singh, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 094413 (2009).

[23] V. Murg, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 195119 (2009).

[24] J. Richter and J. Schulenburg, Eur. Phys. J. B **73**, 117 (2010).

[25] J. Reuther and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 144410 (2010).

[26] A. Sfondrini, J. Cerrillo, N. Schuch, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 214426 (2010).

[27] J.-F. Yu and Y.-J. Kao. Phys. Rev. B **85**, 094407 (2012).

[28] H.-C. Jiang, H. Yao, and L. Balents, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 024424 (2012).

[29] F. Mezzacapo, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 045115 (2012).

[30] T. Li, F. Becca, W. Hu, and S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 075111 (2012).

[31] L. Wang, D. Poilblanc, Z.-C. Gu, X.-G. Wen, F. Verstraete Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 037202 (2013).

[32] W.-J. Hu, F. Becca, A. Parola, and S. Sorella, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 060402 (2013).

[33] X. Zhang and K.S.D. Beach, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 094420 (2013).

[34] Shou-Shu Gong, Wei Zhu, D. N. Sheng, O. I. Motrunich, M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 027201 (2014).

[35] R. L. Doretto, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 104415 (2014).

[36] Y. Qi and Z.-C. Gu, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 235122 (2014).

[37] A. Metavitsiadis, D. Sellmann, and S. Eggert, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 241104(R) (2014).

[38] Y.Z. Ren, N.H. Tong, X.C. Xie, J. Physics: Condensed Matter **26**, 115601 (2014).

[39] Ling Wang, arXiv:1402.3564.

[40] Chung-Pin Chou and Hong-Yi Chen, arXiv:1403.6879.

[41] P. Carretta, N. Papinutto, C. B. Azzoni, M. C. Mozzati, E. Pavarini, S. Gonthier, and P. Millet, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 094420 (2002).

[42] R. Melzi, P. Carretta, A. Lascialfari, M. Mambrini, M. Troyer, P. Millet, and F. Mila, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1318 (2000); 0R. Melzi, S. Aldrovandi, F. Tedoldi, P. Carretta, P. Millet, and F. Mila, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 024409 (2001); H. Rosner, R. R. P. Singh, W. H. Zheng, J. Oitmaa, and W. Pickett, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 014416 (2003).

[43] R. F. Bishop and H. G. Kümmel, Physics Today **40**, 52 (1987); R.F. Bishop, Theor. Chim. Acta **80**, 95 (1991); R. F. Bishop, in *Microscopic Quantum Many-Body Theories and Their Applications*, edited by J. Navarro and A. Polls, Lecture Notes in Physics 510 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998), p.1.

[44] K. Emrich, Nucl. Phys. **A351**, 379, 397 (1981).

[45] R. F. Bishop, D. J. J. Farnell, S. E. Krüger, J. B. Parkinson, J. Richter, and C. Zeng, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **12**, 6887 (2000).

[46] S. E. Krüger, J. Richter, J. Schulenburg, D. J. J. Farnell, and R. F. Bishop, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 14607 (2000).

[47] D.J.J. Farnell, Condensed Matter Physics **12**, 411 (2009).

[48] C. Zeng, D. J. J. Farnell, and R. F. Bishop, J. Stat. Phys. **90**, 327 (1998).

[49] D. J. J. Farnell and R. F. Bishop, in *Quantum Magnetism*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. **645**, edited by U. Schollwöck, J. Richter, D. J. J. Farnell, and R. F. Bishop (Springer, Berlin, 2004), p. 307.

[50] N.B. Ivanov, J. Richter, and D. J. J. Farnell, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 014421 (2002).

[51] R. Darradi, J. Richter, and D. J. J. Farnell, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 104425 (2005).

[52] D.J.J. Farnell, R. Zinke, J. Schulenburg, and J. Richter, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **21**, 406002 (2009).

[53] J. Richter, R. Darradi, J. Schulenburg, D. J. J. Farnell, and H. Rosner, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 174429 (2010).

[54] O. Götze, D.J.J. Farnell, R.F. Bishop, P.H.Y. Li, and J. Richter, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 224428 (2011).

[55] D.J.J. Farnell, R.F. Bishop, P.H.Y. Li, J. Richter, and C. E. Campbell, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 012403 (2011).

[56] R. F. Bishop, P. H. Y. Li, and C. E. Campbell, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 144423 (2013).

[57] R. F. Bishop, P. H. Y. Li, and C. E. Campbell, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 214418 (2013).

[58] D.J.J. Farnell, O. Götze, J. Richter, R.F. Bishop, and P.H.Y. Li, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 184407 (2014).

[59] R. F. Bishop, P. H. Y. Li, and C. E. Campbell, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 214413 (2014).

[60] J.-J. Jiang, Y.-J Liu, F. Tang, C.-H. Yang, and Y.-B. Sheng, Commun. Theor. Phys. **61**, 263 (2014).

[61] R.R.P. Singh, M.P. Gelfand, and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2484 (1988); N.B. Ivanov, S.E. Krüger, and J. Richter, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 2633 (1996); S. Wenzel, L. Bogacz, and W. Janke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 127202 (2008); F.-J. Jiang, Phys. Rev. B **85**, (2012).

[62] H.-J. Mikeska and A. K. Kolezhuk, in *Quantum Magnetism*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. **645**, edited by U. Schollwöck, J. Richter, D. J. J. Farnell, and R. F. Bishop (Springer, Berlin, 2004), p. 1.

[63] D.J.J. Farnell and J. Schulenburg, http://www-e.uni-magdeburg.de/jschulen/ccm/.

[64] The reason for lower accuracy of the spin gap using the collinear striped reference state might by attributed to the facts that (i) we do not have LSUB12 data for the extrapolation and (ii) J_1 bonds within a certain LSUBn approximation belong to contiguous sites, but J_2 bonds do not (this difference becomes relevant for larger J_2, i.e. in the CAF phase).

[65] Typically, the term "spin liquid" is used for a state without any long-range order (magnetic, or more exotic valence-bond etc.), i.e. there is no spontaneously broken symmetry. Usually all correlations exhibit a fast exponential decay. However, a spin liquid might be "critical" or "near-critical", see, e.g., the discussion in Refs. [34] and [39], i.e., it may exhibit a power-law decay or very slow exponential decay of correlation functions.